

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and new claim 11 are in this application.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 2002/0092021 (Yap et al.).

Independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"control mechanism, in the case where a plurality of predetermined different processing is simultaneously performed to said one television signal on said desired channel by each of said signal processing mechanisms, for controlling said switching mechanism so that the signal processing mechanisms are collectively connected to one of said channel selecting mechanisms."
(Emphasis added.)

Thus, the control mechanism of claim 1 may control the switching mechanism so that "the signal processing mechanisms are collectively connected to one of said channel selecting mechanisms." As a result, a plurality of different processing may be simultaneously performed on a television signal. Such arrangement is believed to be described in the present application. As an example, reference is made to Fig. 3 and line 20 of page 39 to line 4 of page 40 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that Yap as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above-identified features of claim 1.

That is, in explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to assert that paragraphs 0056, 0087 and 0098 of Yap disclose the present control mechanism of claim 1. Although such portions of Yap appear to mention a control unit 70 and a control unit 75 and "simultaneously recording . . . two or more programs" and

"simultaneously recording one program while viewing or playing back another program," these portions of Yap do not appear to disclose a control mechanism as specifically recited in claim 1. As an example, such portions of Yap do not appear to disclose a case where "a plurality of predetermined different processing is simultaneously performed to said one television signal," as in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) In other words, such portions of Yap do not appear to disclose simultaneously subjecting the same television signal to a plurality of different processing. Instead, these portions of Yap appear to disclose simultaneously subjecting different television signals to a plurality of different processing.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Yap as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 5, 9 and 10 and new independent claim 11 are distinguishable from Yap as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are dependent from one of the independent claims. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4 and 6-8 are distinguishable from Yap as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/500,486

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-345

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

900646_1.DOC